

NeoCon: NeoComm

The Agenda of the New World Order



Compiled 2008 by
We The People, aka

- John Q. Publix -

PreFace

Neo-Conservatism, *Neo* Con, *Neo*Con from the greek, meaning *new*, is a an ideology. Like any ideology its roots are grounded in the beliefs and attitudes of its leaders and followers.

Neo Conservatives are a political cult that rationalize of their ideology through ancient ethics philosophy. Given the premise of basic ethics: the whole is greater than any of its parts, the conclusion would seem that they are for a better society for all. However, this is symmetrically opposed with their own premise because they are an elite minority. Therefore, their political ideology is flawed from the start.

Basically, the foundations of their belief stem from socialism (We call NeoComm); however, their agenda and actions evidence fascism. This is rather unique. Hitler was a fascist who hated communism, which was the precursor to socialism. Its interesting how Neo Cons wrapped the two together to further their agenda of a new world order.

What is unique about Neo Con's stance is that they successfully wooed the religious right in the United States. This eventually gave them the ear of the Republican party. Neo Cons have been successful in infiltrating high levels of government. After 9/11 Neo Con principles became common ideology for the George Bush administration.

This book is a collection of articles presented so that you, the reader, can draw your own conclusions about Neo Cons. Read it with an open mind. Read it knowing that Neo Cons are very few in number; however, they opt to control the many.

John Q. Publix

Foreword

Who Are Those Guys?

While most of the world is still trying to come to terms with the neo-imperial ambitions of the post-Sept. 11 Bush administration, U.S. political analysts, particularly those on the libertarian right and the left, have been trying to map out the various forces behind the administration's hawks in order to better understand and counteract them.

Most analysts have identified three main components to the coalition behind Bush's aggressive foreign policy: right-wing militarists, of whom Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld is the exemplar; neo-conservatives, led by former Defense Policy Board (DPB) chairman Richard Perle, whose worldview is similar to that of Israel's Likud Party; and Christian Right forces whose leaders are influential with Bush's political guru, Karl Rove.

While these forces are often depicted in the abstract, they constitute a network of flesh-and-blood people who have worked together closely and openly - both in and out of government - for more than 30 years in some cases.

Over that period, they built up what analyst Tom Barry of the Interhemispheric Resource Center (IRC) has called an "infrastructure of the (right-wing) counter-establishment," of key individuals, institutions, think tanks and publications that has emerged as the dominant power in the Republican Party - and not only with respect to foreign policy. Two of the structure's most remarkable characteristics are how few people it includes and how adept they have been in creating new institutions and front groups that act as a vast echo chamber for each other and for

the media, particularly in media-obsessed Washington.

In this, the neo-conservatives, who lack any grassroots constituency, have been especially effective.

In fact, the network consists of a very small elite, much smaller for example than the post-World War II internationalist "establishment" that includes such institutions as the Council on Foreign Relations, the foreign service and the Wall Street lawyers, financiers and business executives who have long dominated US foreign policy. To understand its dimensions and the way it works, Barry and the IRC (for which this author has written articles for compensation) compare it to a spider's web - hence the name of their latest Internet website, Right Web, probably the most comprehensive and integrated effort yet to link the various connections and relationships that have given the "Right" its power and influence.

The site, which is still being developed, covers some 175 individuals and dozens of organizations that have constituted the network over the past quarter century. Even a brief meander through the site demonstrates both just how small and incestuous this network has been and how ambitious are its goals, both in foreign and domestic policy.

Chances are, for example, that you have never heard of the Foundation for Community, Faith-Centered Enterprise, an innocent-sounding initiative that suggests church-based community organizing or perhaps a philanthropic group that awards grants to church-related business initiatives.

In fact, the foundation and its sister group, Americans for Community and Faith-Centered Enterprise, were founded in mid-2001 by Michael Joyce, a right-wing king pin who helped turn the Bradley Foundation into the rainmaker of an ever-growing network of institutes, publications and think tanks.

Joyce told the Washington Post in June 2001 that he launched the two groups at the behest of Rove, who was looking for ways to bolster public support for Bush's efforts to fund religious organizations that provide social services.

If you look more closely at the group's profile on the website, you'll get a better idea of how this two-year-old organization fits into the larger network of the US right. Its associates include William Kristol, the editor of Rupert Murdoch's Weekly Standard and chairman of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) and another neo-conservative, former education secretary William Bennett, for whom Kristol once worked.

Midge Decter, another prominent neo-conservative who co-headed (with Rumsfeld) the Committee for the Free World during the Reagan administration, currently

serves on the foundation's board of visitors, while Jeffrey Bell, former president of another neo-conservative think tank, the Manhattan Institute, serves as the group's Washington lobbyist.

You will find further that all of these individuals have supported the work of PNAC, which played a key role in pushing Bush to war in Iraq, and whose founding statement in 1997 was signed by Rumsfeld, Vice President Dick Cheney and more than half a dozen other top Bush foreign-policy figures, all identified as key hawks. If you click on a different group, say Americans for Victory Over Terrorism (AVOT), you might expect to find a different cast of characters. But this group is headed by Bennett, and among its associates and advisers are L. Paul Bremer, currently the chief of the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) in Iraq; Center for Security Policy (CSP) Director Frank Gaffney; real estate baron Lawrence Kadish; and former CIA director James Woolsey.

If you click on each of these names, you will find that they all have supported PNAC, and when you read Gaffney's profile you will see that he, like Perle, once worked for Washington State Senator Henry Jackson and, indeed, for Perle himself, when the "Dark Prince" toiled at the Pentagon under Reagan.

If you then click on CSP's name, you will soon discover that it is one of the country's most hard-line foreign-policy groups, and has consistently opposed arms control treaties; favored the retention and expansion of Washington's nuclear arsenal; warned of a Chinese takeover of the Panama Canal; and served as a major backer of Likud's policies in the Middle East.

You will also find an astonishing overlap between its board of advisers, PNAC associates and top Bush national-security officials - and that it is funded heavily by big defense contractors.

If, on the other hand, you opt for Woolsey, a frequent guest on Murdoch-owned Fox News, you will find that the former CIA chief is currently a member with Perle of the DPB, works for defense contractor Booz Allen Hamilton, has supported PNAC, acts as CSP's honorary co-chair and served on the Rumsfeld Commission on the ballistic-missile threat.

Woolsey also worked with the National Institute for Public Policy (NIPP), whose bland name disguises a band of nuclear-weapons zealots that has long advocated developing new nukes, smaller nukes, bunker-busting nukes and Star Wars. As depicted by the site, Woolsey also served on the Advisory Board of the Committee for the Liberation of Iraq, a group set up 13 months ago in much the same way that Americans for Community, Faith-Centered Enterprise was - to support Bush's drive to war.

Besides Woolsey, other directors included several other DPB members, including Perle, Eliot Cohen, General Wayne Downing and former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, as well as Kristol and about a dozen people also associated with PNAC. If you click on Perle, whose principal perch is the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), along with Gingrich and former United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, you are likely to find yourself occupied for some time. Ditto for Kristol, whose offices are located just five floors below AEI, close to 17th and L Streets in Washington.

Despite the centrality of both Perle and Kristol, however, the genius of the right's network, as noted by Barry, is its improvisational "architecture."

"Rather than operating from a single blueprint, they constantly renovate and commission additions in the form of new institutes, front groups, media outlets and political projects," he says. "It's a postmodern structure with no central office or main lobby, no fixed foundation, no elevator that takes you to different levels." Compared to its vitality and breadth, according to Barry, its ideological foes on the left, or even in the middle, "resemble aging cobwebs."

Inter Press Service

Source: <http://www.antiwar.com/ips/lobe122303.html>

The sunset years of the neocons - future of neoconservatism

This article by, Michael Rust, was written and published in Insight on the News, Dec 13, 1993. Given its age, it is interesting to read now, especially in context of post 9/11 and the Iraq war.

It's been two decades since socialist writer Michael Harrington slapped a label on a group of dissident writers and scholars who were challenging Great Society liberalism. The newly christened "neoconservatives" weren't happy with the name -- but it stuck.

"I've never been comfortable with it," says Richard John Neuhaus, "but you can't choose what you're called." Norman Podhoretz says he would have preferred "neo-nationalists," since defending America's "fundamental institutions and values" was the group's *raison d'être*. About the only one happy with the name was Irving Kristol, who once said that, having been named Irving, he was "indifferent to baptismal caprice."

By whatever nomenclature, this relatively small bunch of writers, editors and scholars has had a great influence on policy debate. Long before multiculturalism and health care reform became fashionable, neoconservatives were dissenting from liberal orthodoxy on such issues as affirmative action and welfare reform. In the 1970s, they fought what Podhoretz called "the culture of appeasement" and laid the groundwork for much of the Reagan administration's foreign policy initiatives.

During the halcyon days of the Reagan administration, neocons such as Jeane Kirkpatrick, ambassador to the United Nations during Reagan's first term, provided the intellectual underpinnings for the arms buildup that brought about the collapse of what they called, without hesitation, the Evil Empire. Others, such as William Bennett, education secretary from 1985 to 1988, moved the nation toward a conservative domestic agenda and helped establish a network of neocon foundations and think tanks.

Through it all, they took on their political and philosophical enemies in books and magazines--a lot of magazines. "Don't underestimate magazines," says Kristol, who cofounded the Public Interest and its foreign policy sister, the National Interest, because thoughts and policies first expressed in journals have changed the world. And the world has changed rapidly. The Soviet Union is gone, Palestinians and Israelis are shaking hands, and the White House is occupied by Bill Clinton, who during his antiwar activist days was the sort of student who turned liberal professors toward neoconservatism. As the original neocons head toward their dotage, some wonder if the group once described by Esquire as "the most important intellectual movement" in the country will become a concern of historians rather than polemicists.

"They're still very much among the living." says Gary Dorrien, author of *The Neoconservative Mind* and a professor of religion at Kalamazoo College in Michigan. According to Dorrien, neoconservatives remain at the forefront of policy debate for two reasons. First, their support for "exporting democracy" is the main foreign policy alternative to "this confused muddle of realpolitik that everyone else is awash in now." Second, their renewed vigor in fighting "what they would call the cultural war is another vital life sign." While it is unlikely that neocons will regain the political influence they enjoyed in the 1980s, they are a "potent intellectual movement" in American politics, he says.

Initially, neoconservatism was, in the most basic sense of the word, a politics of reaction-- an impassioned response to the failures and excesses of liberalism, the milieu from which most neocons came. Christopher Hitchens, a *Vanity Fair* columnist and left-wing journalist, describes neoconservatism as the last flowering of New York intellectualism, a movement of a sometimes brilliant, always contentious collection of urban literati who clustered around magazines such as *Partisan Review*, the *New Leader* and *Dissent* in the 1940s and 1950s. Real neocons had to meet certain criteria, one of which was having been an ex-Marxist, "usually an ex-Trotskyist," says Hitchens.

Indeed, philosophical infighting was "wonderful intellectual training," says Kristol, recalling the era when Leon Trotsky and John Dewey debated in the pages of the *New Internationalist*. Querulous by nature, an instinct exacerbated by a tradition that

elevated intellectual disagreement into a blood sport, neocons engaged in exuberant, often acerbic debate about politics and culture. Even today, New York writer Paul Berman calls them the last believers in the power of ideas -- "the conviction that if you can get the analysis of society straight, you'll accomplish great things." "Spiritually, they are people of the left," says Justin Raimondo, author of *Reclaiming the American Right* and a libertarian who concurs that the neocons' youthful leftism has shaped their attitudes to this day. "That's why they are for a conservative welfare state." In the sixties, however, the heresy of the neocons proved traumatic for some segments of what later would be labeled the cultural elite. "There was such shock in New York intellectual circles at the existence of such people, former liberals, former leftists, who used their skills -- in writing, editing, polemics -- against them," remembers Kristol.

The actual genesis of neoconservatism dates back to 1965, when Kristol responded to the tumult of that decade by founding the *Public Interest*, a policy quarterly, with sociologist Daniel Bell. Kristol once remarked that when a neoconservative sees a problem, he starts a journal. In 1960, for example, the precocious 30-year-old Podhoretz became editor of the *American Jewish Committee's Commentary*. Toward the end of that tumultuous decade, Podhoretz began publishing attacks on the New Left, student uprisings and the Black Power movement. In the 1970s, the magazine sounded a clarion call warning of the "present danger" of Soviet expansionism. In the 1980s, the groundswell of neoconservative publishing turned into an avalanche. During that decade, Hilton Kramer began the *New Criterion* to fight the cultural battles, while Neuhaus's *First Things* and Michael Novak's *Crisis* explored religious and ethical issues.

Despite a good two decades, or perhaps because of it, the movement "began to phase out in the mid-1980s," says Kristol. Young people who stated their careers with neoconservative publications and organizations no longer felt the need for a modifying prefix. At the American Enterprise Institute, a Washington think tank, "the young kids call these guys [the grandpas]," says Dorrien.

American Spectator Editor R. Emmett Tyrrell Jr. explains the rise and fall of the movement in terms of reality and illusion. Says Tyrrell, "In the seventies neoconservatives were addressing social and public policy questions that were genuine. They were addressing issues like income redistribution in realistic terms." In the Clinton era, serious discussion of policy issues is virtually impossible, says Tyrrell. When New York Democratic Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan commented that Clinton's plan to fund health care reform was "fantasy," the White House ignored it "with the implication that Bill Clinton had worked much harder on this than Pat Moynihan," he says with a laugh.

If friends suggest that the times are too mundane for the neocons, foes take a quite different tack. Some leftists suggest that the collapse of the Soviet Union had a silver lining -- it removed any reason for being for neoconservatism. Hitchens has argued that without communism to fend off, neocons will fade away. "Indeed, the most flattering thing you can say is that pretty much everything that has happened to them also happened to the things they were against," he concludes.

If that were the case, it would be welcomed by historian Paul Gottfried, a "paleoconservative" who has engaged in a long, acrimonious quarrel with the neocons. In the waning days of the Cold War, conservative journals and conferences were filled with acrid exchanges between neo- and paleoconservatives. Paleos, many of whom rallied around Pat Buchanan's presidential bid, criticize their rivals as too interventionist in foreign affairs, too statist in economics and too egalitarian in philosophy. Perhaps most important, they see the neocons as dominating conservative foundations, think tanks and publications. According to Gottfried, a professor at Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania and author of *The Conservative Movement*, "They pretty much determine the agenda."

The internecine quarrel seems to have calmed down--many of the participants tired of the dispute and now find the Clinton administration a more inviting target -- and Tyrrell thinks no lasting damage was done. "Conservatism, if we are to listen to its critics, is the longest-dying political philosophy in American history," he says. Many feuds have sparked and sputtered over the years, and "most of these feuds have to do not with fundamental issues, but with egos.... They are very sensitive egos, because they are the egos of people who have often been marginalized by our liberal culture."

At least the battle has forced the liberal culture to pay attention. Left-leaning critics admit to a certain fascination with the whole business. "I found it a great pleasure debating and arguing with them," says Hitchens. but he notes with some satisfaction the price they have paid for public exposure. "They took to power, I felt, altogether too readily," he says. Now that the salad days of Reaganism are a memory, neoconservatives are suffering pangs of power withdrawal, he suggests, "and it's self-inflicted."

Dorrien agrees that part of the problem faced by neocons today is that "a fairly small cadre of intellectuals" were so spectacularly successful that "anything after that, by comparison, especially with what's gone on in the world, seems to have rendered them into oblivion." The libertarian Raimondo also points to the corrupting influence of power. "Any conservative intellectual who has access [to the trappings of power] is going to eventually sell out, because it's inconvenient to bring up these ideas that are politically incorrect," he says. "Whenever they need somebody on the right side of the spectrum for MacNeil-Lehrer, they just grab one of the neocons,

and they have a tame, lapdog conservative."

For Tyrrell, this has an all-too-familiar ring. "The liberals have always said, with fingers firmly crossed behind their backs, that what they really wanted was a respectable, intellectual conservatism in this country," he says. "Well, Norman Podhoretz, Jeane Kirkpatrick and Irving Kristol brought them one--and after about six years of it, they decided it was just as crazy and morally reprehensible as all conservatism." Kristol dismisses the criticisms as more intellectual crankiness. "We write better and we think better," he says. "That's why we have more influence." Indeed, neoconservatism "added intellectual leaven to the Republican Party." Hitchens thinks the original neocons might enjoy a break from policy to relish "the pleasures of release from politicization." After all, he says, "they were a group that said they were against the politicization of everything. That was something they always accused the left of wanting, a totally politicized life."

But, as Gottfried points out, neoconservatism will exert influence for decades to come, even if the movement seems to have split into two camps, with some, such as columnist Charles Krauthammer and National Interest Editor Owen Harries, supporting a "realist" foreign policy, and others, such as Joshua Muravchik of the American Enterprise Institute, calling for the "export of democracy." The split isn't that deep, says Podhoretz. "It would take a real crisis for a disagreement like that to get bitter, and Bosnia hasn't done it."

But old foreign policy battles aren't completely over, either. Dorrien says neoconservative defense policy was a baleful influence, even if it led to the Soviet collapse. "If we had husbanded some of our resources and not more than doubled Pentagon budgets in the eighties, we would find ourselves in a much better position today," he says.

Along with anticommunism, neoconservatives were strongly identified with support for Israel. Hitchens thinks the agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization puts neocons in the "hopeless position: of confronting an elected Israeli government "that has done what they would have denounced anyone else for even suggesting."

For Podhoretz, the lesson of these viewpoints are clear: "For a lot of people, being on the left means never having to say you're sorry-- or you're wrong. They're very good at this kind of stubborn persistence." This is important, he stresses, "because who defines the past defines the future."

As for Kristol, he's not even worried about foreign policy. "We'll muddle through okay," he says, "It's very difficult to come up with a coherent, principled agenda on foreign policy." Nor are most domestic initiatives -- which are doomed to failure by budget constraints -- particularly bothersome. The important things, says Kristol, are religious and cultural issues.

Political scientist James Q. Wilson recently tried to bypass the religious angle of cultural conservatism by arguing in his book *The Moral Sense* that people have an innate "genetic" sense of right and wrong. The neocons, however, were never shy about ethics and religion. "It was always untrue that the neos were a secular, liberal group, says Podhoretz. "That was paleo propaganda." Many neoconservatives have close ties with established religions, including Catholics such as Novak and George Weigel of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, and Lutherans such as Peter Berger, a sociologist who has sought to reconcile a conservative defense of institutions such as the family and religious orthodoxy with the revolutionary dynamics of capitalism. Leftists predictably find much here to trouble them. Hitchens, for example, says neoconservatives "never had an honest discussion" about the de facto alliance they made with fundamentalist Christians. This, he claims, was "one thing I always found which was hateful about them -- and had nothing to do with their opinions."

Other say there is nothing peculiar about any such alliance. Political theorist Leo Strauss, who sought to restore the influence of the "ancients"-- Aristotle and Plato -- over modern political philosophy, was a major influence on the movement. Straussian thought holds that a virtuous citizenry should be promoted by the state. Neuhaus, a Lutheran minister turned Catholic priest sounds a similar theme in explaining why the religious right is an essential part of any conservative alliance. The essence of democracy is majority rule, says Neuhaus, "which means you have to get millions and millions of people, many of whom are going to be an embarrassment to you [to agree on issues]. But then, I don't know -- I may be an embarrassment to them."

Neuhaus says most neoconservatives agree that "the first thing is not politics. Politics is a function of culture, and at the heart of culture is morality, and at the heart of morality is religion." They are "people who believe the American experiment is premised upon a history of civilization that has its groundings in Athens and Jerusalem." One part of the great divide in American society believes that America's future "depends upon the continued assertion of these truths which are essentially moral truths, and on the other side are those who believe in a new religion of radical individualism beyond encumbered self -- in which there are, in fact, no moral truths, in which in fact the very notion of moral truths they consider oxymoronic." A project Podhoretz is considering for his retirement, which will occur in 1995 when he marks his 35th year as editor of *Commentary*, is to complete his autobiographical trilogy. In 1968 he published *Making It*, which told of his rise as a successful literateur; in 1979 came *Breaking Ranks*, which recounted his journey to political heresy. Completing the autobiographical trilogy would be a book dealing with religion. By the time his latest work appears, however, the term neoconservative may be an anachronism. Podhoretz thinks that is not necessarily the case. "There is by now a history here," he says. "People who feel most comfortable, or have a greater sense of affinity with that tradition-- well, they call themselves young

neocons even though they're not actually neo."

Some younger conservatives may find the persona established by Podhoretz, Kristol and other -- urban, intellectual, sophisticated, combative -- an attractive option. The original neoconservatives never felt comfortable with the label, but these younger writers, scholars and policy analysts may not be burdened by such concerns.

If the neoconservative pedigree lasts into the future, it will be another accomplishment for what in essence was a small, contentious group of intellectuals. But then, small numbers don't necessarily mean little influence. After all, notes Kristol, "there were only 12 apostles."

Source: 1993 News World Communications, Inc.

The Fraud of Neoconservative "Anti-Communism"

by Max Shpak

Neoconservatives and their apologists would have the public believe that the neocons were former Leftists who saw the light and came to reject liberal or Marxist ideology as a matter of conviction and principle. Regrettably, this official line has come to be conventional wisdom, no doubt reflecting neocon efforts to hide the fact that their transformation was neither sincerely motivated nor sincerely enacted. To understand the real agenda that drove and continues to drive much of neoconservatism, one needs to look back to the origins of the movement and the cultural backgrounds of those who lead it.

It is a well-established fact that many of the early luminaries of neoconservatism (most famously Irving Kristol in the 1940's, a more recent famous example being David Horowitz) came from Marxist backgrounds, and that neoconservatism (like Marxism itself) began and continues to be a largely a phenomenon of Jewish intellectualism. In the early part of the 20th century, Marxism attracted a disproportionate pool of Jewish recruits for a number of obvious reasons. There are a number of complex psychological and social reasons for the attraction, all of which largely stem from the fact that Marxist internationalism is an ideology which by its very nature finds disciples among a rootless, anti-religious urban intelligentsia.

More important for the purposes of this analysis, however, are the practical reasons for Jewish sympathy with Bolshevism. European and American Jews alike carried deep-seated hatreds for the traditional regimes and religions of the European continent, particularly Czarist Russia and various Eastern European nations due to (real and imagined) "persecution" and "pogroms" that occurred there. Thus, when the Bolsheviks overthrew the Czar, destroyed the hated Orthodox Church, rendered powerless the landed religious peasantry, and replaced traditional Russian authority with a largely Jewish Commissariate, world Jewry (including alleged "capitalists" like the Schiffs and Rothschilds) embraced the Revolution and Marxist ideology alike.

With Russia becoming an effective Jewish colony where "anti-Semitism" was an offense punishable by death and the native gentile culture was effectively stamped out (thanks to a leadership consisting mainly of Jews such as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Severdlov, held together under the stewardship of the obsequious philosemite Lenin), Jews throughout the world put their hopes in the possibility of similar revolutions elsewhere. Indeed, their comrades in arms were hard at work affecting similar changes in Hungary (Kuhn), Austria (Adler) and Germany (Eisner). The rise of Fascist and Nazi movements only served to further polarize Jewish support in favor of international communism.

This near unanimity would change as a result of two developments: a shift in the character of Soviet Communism on the one hand and the foundation of the State of Israel on the other. Stalin's purges of many of his former Bolshevik colleagues (including Trotsky, who was assassinated while in exile), his 1939 pact with Hitler, and rumors of Stalin's own anti-Jewish prejudices gave many would-be supporters pause. When Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, it became clear the Russian masses would not fight for the sake of Bolshevism, an ideology that brought them so much misery, but rather for the sake of Russian blood and soil. From then on, the Soviet leadership had to court the very Russian nationalist elements that the early Bolsheviks had worked so hard to stamp out. This led to an increasing tolerance towards the Russian Orthodox Church and a decreased Jewish presence in the Soviet politburo and KGB. Thus, the USSR was "betraying" the very elements that made it attractive to the Jewish establishment to begin with.

Perhaps even more significant a factor in the origins of neoconservatism was the emergence of an independent Israeli state. While many Jewish Marxists eagerly supported the Zionist state, the more intellectually consistent Left opposed Zionism on the grounds that all nationalisms, including Jewish ones, are enemies of global proletarian revolution. Thus, Jewish leftists who once advocated internationalism for gentile nations were forced to come to terms with the implications of this ideology for their own nationalist sentiments. Thus, they needed an ideology which would let them have their cake (opposing gentile nationalism) and eat it too (by supporting

Israel), and they found just such a worldview with neoconservatism. At the same time, although the Soviet Union initially courted Israel during the 1948 wars of independence, it became clear to the Israeli government that in world polarized between the United States and the Soviet Union the former would be wealthier and more pliant cash cow to milk. By the 1950's and the coming of the Suez Wars, regardless of residual Jewish loyalties to Communism, the battle lines were already drawn, with Israel in the US/Western camp and the Arab nations forced to make alliances of convenience with the Soviet Union.

It is hardly a coincidence that the changing character of Soviet Communism and the status of Israel as a US ally came at the same time that neoconservatism was becoming an influential political movement. For all of their talk about "capitalism," "democracy," "freedom," and "free markets," the fact that so many Jewish leftists turned on a dime to back the US in the Cold War because America could serve as a life support system for Israel and a bulwark against resurgent Russian "anti-Semitism" makes their real agenda entirely transparent. One can witness an identical phenomenon taking place today, as many Jewish liberal Democrats switch party ranks and join the GOP because of the latter's stronger support for Israel and harder line with the Arab nations. All of the window dressing about their newfound "patriotism" and "Americanism" is a sham designed to mask the fact that the question for the neocons has always been and will always be "is it good for the Jews?"

The different agendas driving neocon Cold Warriors as opposed to their erstwhile Old Right allies could be seen on any number of fronts. The most obvious one has been the different reactions in the two camps to Russia after the end of the Cold War. While paleoconservative leaning Cold Warriors such as Pat Buchanan have pushed for normalized relations with Russia, the neocons continue to fight on the Cold War, enthusiastically supporting Chechen separatists as "freedom fighters" and advocating NATO expansion. The reasons for this difference are entirely obvious: the Old Right's enemy was Communist ideology, while neoconservative Jews nurtured a hatred for Russian nationalism. Thus post-Communist Russia is still very much a threat to the latter, particularly with resurgent Russian "ultra-nationalism" and "anti-Semitism," while in the absence of Communist rule the above are of little concern to the Old Right.

For all their talk about "anti-Communism," the real engine driving neocon Cold Warrior instincts was punishing the hated Russian goyim for the sin of "anti-Semitism," not any opposition to residual or latent Marxism. As further evidence that this is the case, one need only consider the fact that while the Old Right championed Christian dissidents such as Solzhenitsyn, to the neocons the only legitimate "dissidents" were Zionists like Natan Sharansky, just as the only "refugees" championed by the neos were invariably Jewish (including today's shady Odessa Mafiosi). Solzhenitsyn represented the Russian nationalism and Orthodox Church that made

so many of the neocons' predecessors embrace Bolshevism, thus Solzhenitsyn and the plight of Christian dissidents were relegated to obscurity in neocon publications, while Zionist noise-makers in the USSR were given a hero's welcome.

In this regard, the neocons are the true heirs to Leon Trotsky, who condemned Stalin and his followers not so much for their brutality (as commander of the Red Army and overseer of Lenin's terrorist CHEKA, Trotsky was no stranger to brutality and sadism) but for their "anti-Semitism" and "betrayal of the Revolution." Trotsky's main critique of Stalinism seemed to be that Stalin was moving Russia in a nationalist direction rather than working towards the establishment of an international "proletarian" vanguard. The fact that the intellectual ancestors of neoconservatism had not an unkind word to say about Bolshevism while Leninist-Trotskyite goals were being fulfilled suggests that it was not so much ideological reconsideration as tribal self-interest that drove these most unlikely conversos.

Because their move from the Left to a pseudo-right was insincere, one would expect to find a whole range of issues where the neocons retain leftist instincts and remain true to their Trotskyite heritage. Indeed this is the case. In their portrayal of the Cold War as a struggle between "capitalism" on the one hand and "socialism" on the other, the neocons try to minimize the fact that in many ways the conflict between the Bolsheviks and the West was over much more than economic systems. To most on the Old Right, the economic issues were at best peripheral: Marxism was opposed because it was materialistic, atheistic, and because it rejected nationalism and patriotism in the name of global revolution.

Most neocons came from a culture that was every bit as materialistic and cosmopolitan as the early Bolshevik leaders, so it is rather unlikely that they would have any quarrel with these aspects of Communist doctrine. The fact that neoconservatism is an ideology which is materialistic in nature and internationalist in focus (with its talk of "global democracy" and "global markets") makes it obvious that the fundamental underpinnings of the Marxist Left are alive and well among the scribblers of *Commentary* and *The Weekly Standard*. Their "conservative" pretenses seem limited to the fact that they oppose "socialism" (of the nationalist variety) in the name of "capitalism" (of the internationalist variety), and for all too many naïve people that seems to be sufficient and believable.

Understanding the true nature of the neoconservatives illuminates the essence of the struggle between the Right and the Left. It was never a struggle between "capitalism" and "socialism" as neoconservative or Communist propaganda would have one believe. Rather, it was always a conflict between spiritualism and materialism, between nationalism and globalism, between tradition and subversion, between the defenders of Western Civilization and its enemies. With the battle lines drawn as such, it is abundantly clear where the neocons stand. Many "capitalists" understood that economic means are not significant, only the desired end. Jacob Schiff under-

stood it when he financed the Bolsheviks, just as Rupert Murdoch, Ted Turner, Marc Rich, Boris Berezovsky, and George Soros understand that their form of "capitalism" is fully compatible with the essence of the Left, and that they can find friends and allies among the ostensibly conservative neocons. Unfortunately, many Rightists are not nearly as perceptive in their choice of allies.

Max Shpah, May 15, 2002

Source: <http://www.originaldissent.com/shpak051502.html>

Neocons: Commie Bait

Ray McGovern

The neocons over at the Weekly Standard-the house organ of the Straussian neocon movement-have vehemently attacked former CIA analyst Ray McGovern in the wake of his confronting Donald Rumsfeld. In Bushzarro world, opposition to the occupation of Iraq is "extremism" and cheer leading the murder of around 200,000 Iraqis is patriotism. The Weekly Standard accuses McGovern of acting "as front man for an exceedingly unsavory group called Not In Our Name," described as "a coalition formed in 2002 by the likes of the Maoist Revolutionary Communist party."

A quick Google search of the organization turns up little on its supposed communist affiliation, except by way of accusations made by the usual suspects-the rabid and vile freepers and predictably emanating from Frontpage Magazine, a website run with Scaife money by the former Marxist turned neocon, David Horowitz.

It is interesting the neocons would call McGovern a commie, or rather a commie dupe. As is well-known, or should be, the Old Guard of the Straussian neocon movement is comprised of Trotskyites. "Authentic neocons descend from the Communist and socialist movements, with the most prominent leaders being Trotskyites (that is, ultra-Left Communists)," writes Dale Vree for the New Oxford Review.

"Neoconservatism's key founders trace their intellectual ancestry to the 'New York Intellectuals,' a group that originated as followers of Trotskyite theoretician Max Schachtman in the 1930s and centered around influential journals like Partisan Review and Commentary (which is in fact published by the American Jewish Committee)," writes Kevin

MacDonald. "In the case of neoconservatives, their early identity as radical leftist disciples shifted as there began to be evidence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Key figures in leading them out of the political left were philosopher Sidney Hook and Elliot Cohen, editor of *Commentary*. Such men as Hook, Irving Kristol, Norman Podhoretz, Nathan Glazer and Seymour Martin Lipset, were deeply concerned about anti-Semitism and other Jewish issues. Many of them worked closely with Jewish activist organizations. After the 1950s, they became increasingly disenchanted with leftism. Their overriding concern was the welfare of Israel."

"Many of the top chieftains of the War Party are ex-leftists of one sort or another," explains Justin Raimondo. "They owe more to Hegel, Marx, and Leon Trotsky than to Russell Kirk, Friedrich Hayek, and Ludwig von Mises. The 'godfather' of the neo-conservative movement, Irving Kristol, was a Trotskyite in his youth, and the kibitzing that went on in Cubicle B at City College of New York has achieved the status of legend. The official line, of course, is that this was all just a youthful indiscretion and that any such allegiances have long since been put away in a trunk somewhere." In essence, the Straussian neocons are Marxist reactionaries with a deep and long Jacobin streak.

Raimondo continues:

The ideological framework of neoconservative ideology is deeply rooted in the Marxist tradition. Francis Fukuyama, the boy wonder of the neocons, even came up with an application of the Hegelian dialectic as the ultimate rationale for American global hegemony in his famous article on "The End of History." The Marxists, too, saw themselves as agents of History, and they constantly evoked images of modernity to justify their innumerable crimes against humanity. They came as "liberators"-a favorite word of Red Army propagandists, and one that our own Pentagon has since taken up with alacrity.

The neocons retain the methods as well as the ideology of the left: party-line politics, periodic purges, and the nasty habit of smearing their opponents rather than engaging them in debate. The neocon method echoes that of its leftist progenitors: Once the party line is established-Israel must be unconditionally defended, Iraq must be utterly destroyed, Pat Buchanan must be smeared into silence-anyone who deviates is demonized.

It should be noted that neocons such as David Horowitz and Stephen Schwartz are former communists who went over to the neocon Dark Side and brought their pedantic and doctrinaire baggage along for the ride. It is sincerely creepy to read Horowitz-he still sounds like a Marxist, although instead of evil capitalists he now excoriates Muslims and his former comrades and his response to the latter hints at the Stalinesque-they are traitors probably best herded in detention camps.

Stephen Schwartz, who "speaks of Trotsky affectionately" (see Trotsky's ghost wandering the White House, *National Post*), is a frequent contributor to the *Weekly Standard*, a magazine owned by Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation (Murdoch also owns Fox News where neocons rant and rave daily).

It is really quite strange to witness former (and in the case of Schwartz, apparently

active) Trotskyites slamming Ray McGovern-a former CIA employee who presented morning intelligence briefings at the White House for years-as a commie dupe. McGovern is a distinguished military graduate who served in the US Army from 1962-64 as an intelligence officer, while most if not virtually all of the Straussian neocons are chicken hawks and military service shirkers (recall Cheney had "other priorities" during Vietnam and Rush Limbaugh skipped out due to a pilonidal cyst, an appropriate malady considering his vile personality).

If indeed Not In Our Name is a commie front, it must not be the sort of communism approved by the Straussian neocons, a cabal of warmongers drawing ideological sustenance from vanguard Trotskyism, advocating "permanent revolution," an ideology so radical and dangerous not even the fanatical Stalin would cotton to it. Instead, he had Leon Trotsky killed by assassin Ramón Mercader, who drove the pick of an ice axe into Trotsky's skull in Mexico City, circa 1940.

Source:

Neocons: Commie Bait Ray McGovern

Saturday May 13th 2006, 10:58 pm

<http://kurtnimmo.com/?p=366>

<http://community.freespeech.org/node/3822>

Strong Must Rule the Weak, said Neo-Cons' Muse

by Jim Lobe

WASHINGTON - Is U.S. foreign policy being run by followers of an obscure German Jewish political philosopher whose views were elitist, amoral and hostile to democratic government?

Suddenly, political Washington is abuzz about Leo Strauss, who arrived in the United States in 1938 and taught at several major universities before his death in 1973.

Thanks to the "Week in Review" section of last Sunday's 'New York Times' and another investigative article in this week's 'New Yorker' magazine, the cognoscenti have suddenly been made aware that key neo-conservative strategists behind the Bush administration's aggressive foreign and military policy consider themselves to be followers of Strauss, although the philosopher - an expert on Plato and Aristotle - rarely addressed current events in his writings.

The most prominent is Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, now widely known as "Wolfowitz of Arabia" for his obsession with ousting Iraq's Saddam Hussein as the first step in transforming the entire Arab Middle East. Wolfowitz is also seen as the chief architect of Washington's post-9/11 global strategy, including its controversial pre-emption policy.

Two other very influential Straussians include 'Weekly Standard' Chief Editor William Kristol and Gary Schmitt, founder, chairman and director of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), a six-year-old neo-conservative group whose alumni include Vice President Dick Cheney and Pentagon chief Donald Rumsfeld, as well as a number of other senior foreign policy officials.

PNAC's early prescriptions and subsequent open letters to President George W. Bush on how to fight the war on terrorism have anticipated to an uncanny extent precisely what the administration has done.

Kristol's father Irving, the godfather of neo-conservatism who sits on the board of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) where a number of prominent hawks, including former Defense Policy Board chairman Richard Perle, are based, has also credited Strauss with being one of the main influences on his thinking.

While the Times article introduced readers to Strauss and his disciples in Washington, interest was further piqued this week by a lengthy article by The New Yorker's legendary investigative reporter, Seymour Hersh, who noted that Abram Shulsky, a close Perle associate who has run a special intelligence unit in Rumsfeld's office, is also a Straussian.

His unit, according to Hersh, re-interpreted evidence of Iraq's alleged links to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda terrorist network and possession of weapons of mass destruction to support those in the administration determined to go to war with Baghdad. The article also identified Stephen Cambone, one of Rumsfeld's closest aides who heads the new post of undersecretary of Defense for intelligence, as a Strauss follower.

In his article, Hersh wrote that Strauss believed the world to be a place where "isolated liberal democracies live in constant danger from hostile elements abroad", and where policy advisers may have to deceive their own publics and even their rulers in order to protect their countries.

Shadia Drury, author of 1999's 'Leo Strauss and the American Right', says Hersh is right on the second count but dead wrong on the first. "Strauss was neither a liberal nor a democrat," she said in a telephone interview from her office at the University of Calgary in Canada. "Perpetual deception of the citizens by those in power is critical (in Strauss's view) because they need to be led, and they need strong rulers to tell them what's good for them."

"The Weimar Republic (in Germany) was his model of liberal democracy for which he had huge contempt," added Drury. Liberalism in Weimar, in Strauss's view, led ultimately to the Nazi Holocaust against the Jews.

Like Plato, Strauss taught that within societies, "some are fit to lead, and others to be led", according to Drury. But, unlike Plato, who believed that leaders had to be people with such high moral standards that they could resist the temptations of power, Strauss thought that "those who are fit to rule are those who realize there is no morality and that there is only one natural right, the right of the superior to rule over the inferior".

For Strauss, "religion is the glue that holds society together", said Drury, who added that Irving Kristol, among other neo-conservatives, has argued that separating church and state was the biggest mistake made by the founders of the U.S. republic. "Secular society in their view is the worst possible thing", because it leads to individualism, liberalism and relativism, precisely those traits that might encourage dissent, which in turn could dangerously weaken society's ability to cope with external threats. "You want a crowd that you can manipulate like putty," according to Drury. Strauss was also strongly influenced by Thomas Hobbes. Like Hobbes, he thought the fundamental aggressiveness of human nature could be restrained only through a powerful state based on nationalism. "Because mankind is intrinsically wicked, he has to be governed," he once wrote. "Such governance can only be established, however, when men are united - and they can only be united against other people".

"Strauss thinks that a political order can be stable only if it is united by an external threat," Drury wrote in her book. "Following Machiavelli, he maintains that if no external threat exists, then one has to be manufactured. Had he lived to see the collapse of the Soviet Union, he would have been deeply troubled because the collapse of the 'evil empire' poses a threat to America's inner stability."

"In Strauss' view, you have to fight all the time (to survive)," said Drury. "In that respect, it's very Spartan. Peace leads to decadence. Perpetual war, not perpetual peace, is what Straussians believe in." Such views naturally lead to an "aggressive, belligerent foreign policy", she added.

As for what a Straussian world order might look like, Drury said the philosopher often talked about Jonathan Swift's story of Gulliver and the Lilliputians. "When Lilliput was on fire, Gulliver urinated over the city, including the palace. In so doing, he saved all of Lilliput from catastrophe, but the Lilliputians were outraged and appalled by such a show of disrespect."

For Strauss, the act demonstrates both the superiority and the isolation of the leader within a society and, presumably, the leading country vis-a-vis the rest of the world. Drury suggests it is ironic, but not inconsistent with Strauss' ideas about the necessity for elites to deceive their citizens, that the Bush administration defends its anti-terrorist campaign by resorting to idealistic rhetoric. "They really have no use for liberalism and democracy, but they're conquering the world in the name of liberalism and democracy," she said.

Source: <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines03/0508-02.htm>

Consequences: Going bankrupt: The US's greatest threat

By Chalmers Johnson

*If a business goes broke, they can go out of business.
Eventually the United States of America
will go out of business.*

The military adventurers of the George W Bush administration have much in common with the corporate leaders of the defunct energy company Enron. Both groups of men thought that they were the "smartest guys in the room", the title of Alex Gibney's prize-winning film on what went wrong at Enron. The neo-conservatives in the White House and the Pentagon outsmarted themselves. They failed even to address the problem of how to finance their schemes of imperialist wars and global domination.

As a result, going into 2008, the United States finds itself in the anomalous position of being unable to pay for its own elevated living standards or its wasteful, overly large military establishment. Its government no longer even attempts to reduce the ruinous

expenses of maintaining huge standing armies, replacing the equipment that seven years of wars have destroyed or worn out, or preparing for a war in outer space against unknown adversaries.

Instead, the Bush administration puts off these costs for future generations to pay - or repudiate. This utter fiscal irresponsibility has been disguised through many manipulative financial schemes (such as causing poorer countries to lend us unprecedented sums of money), but the time of reckoning is fast approaching.

There are three broad aspects to our debt crisis. First, in the current fiscal year (2008) we are spending insane amounts of money on "defense" projects that bear no relationship to the national security of the United States. Simultaneously, we are keeping the income tax burdens on the richest segments of the American population at strikingly low levels.

Second, we continue to believe that we can compensate for the accelerating erosion of our manufacturing base and our loss of jobs to foreign countries through massive military expenditures - so-called "military Keynesianism", which I discuss in detail in my book *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic*. By military Keynesianism, I mean the mistaken belief that public policies focused on frequent wars, huge expenditures on weapons and munitions, and large standing armies can indefinitely sustain a wealthy capitalist economy. The opposite is actually true.

Third, in our devotion to militarism (despite our limited resources), we are failing to invest in our social infrastructure and other requirements for the long-term health of our country. These are what economists call "opportunity costs", things not done because we spent our money on something else. Our public education system has deteriorated alarmingly. We have failed to provide health care to all our citizens and neglected our responsibilities as the world's number one polluter. Most important, we have lost our competitiveness as a manufacturer for civilian needs - an infinitely more efficient use of scarce resources than arms manufacturing. Let me discuss each of these.

The current fiscal disaster

It is virtually impossible to overstate the profligacy of what our government spends on the military. The Department of Defense's planned expenditures for fiscal year 2008 are larger than all other nations' military budgets combined. The supplementary budget to pay for the current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, not part of the official defense budget, is itself larger than the combined military budgets of Russia and China. Defense-related spending for fiscal 2008 will exceed \$1 trillion for the first time in history. The United States has become the largest single salesman of arms and munitions to other nations on Earth. Leaving out of account Bush's two on-

going wars, defense spending has doubled since the mid-1990s. The defense budget for fiscal 2008 is the largest since World War II.

Before we try to break down and analyze this gargantuan sum, there is one important caveat. Figures on defense spending are notoriously unreliable. The numbers released by the Congressional Reference Service and the Congressional Budget Office do not agree with each other. Robert Higgs, senior fellow for political economy at the Independent Institute, says, "A well-founded rule of thumb is to take the Pentagon's (always well publicized) basic budget total and double it."

Even a cursory reading of newspaper articles about the Department of Defense will turn up major differences in statistics about its expenses. Some 30-40% of the defense budget is "black", meaning that these sections contain hidden expenditures for classified projects. There is no possible way to know what they include or whether their total amounts are accurate.

There are many reasons for this budgetary sleight-of-hand - including a desire for secrecy on the part of the president, the secretary of defense and the military-industrial complex - but the chief one is that members of Congress, who profit enormously from defense jobs and pork-barrel projects in their districts, have a political interest in supporting the Department of Defense.

In 1996, in an attempt to bring accounting standards within the executive branch somewhat closer to those of the civilian economy, Congress passed the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act. It required all federal agencies to hire outside auditors to review their books and release the results to the public. Neither the Department of Defense, nor the Department of Homeland Security, has ever complied. Congress has complained, but not penalized either department for ignoring the law. The result is that all numbers released by the Pentagon should be regarded as suspect.

In discussing the fiscal 2008 defense budget, as released to the press on February 7, 2007, I have been guided by two experienced and reliable analysts: William D Hartung of the New America Foundation's Arms and Security Initiative and Fred Kaplan, defense correspondent for Slate.org. They agree that the Department of Defense requested \$481.4 billion for salaries, operations (except in Iraq and Afghanistan), and equipment.

They also agree on a figure of \$141.7 billion for the "supplemental" budget to fight the global "war on terror" - that is, the two on-going wars that the general public may think are actually covered by the basic Pentagon budget. The Department of Defense also asked for an extra \$93.4 billion to pay for hitherto unmentioned war costs in the remainder of 2007 and, most creatively, an additional "allowance" (a

new term in defense budget documents) of \$50 billion to be charged to fiscal year 2009. This comes to a total spending request by the Department of Defense of \$766.5 billion.

But there is much more. In an attempt to disguise the true size of the American military empire, the government has long hidden major military-related expenditures in departments other than Defense. For example, \$23.4 billion for the Department of Energy goes toward developing and maintaining nuclear warheads; and \$25.3 billion in the Department of State budget is spent on foreign military assistance (primarily for Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the United Arab Republic, Egypt, and Pakistan).

Another \$1.03 billion outside the official Department of Defense budget is now needed for recruitment and reenlistment incentives for the overstretched US military itself, up from a mere \$174 million in 2003, the year the war in Iraq began. The Department of Veterans Affairs currently gets at least \$75.7 billion, 50% of which goes for the long-term care of the grievously injured among the at least 28,870 soldiers so far wounded in Iraq and another 1,708 in Afghanistan. The amount is universally derided as inadequate. Another \$46.4 billion goes to the Department of Homeland Security.

Missing as well from this compilation is \$1.9 billion to the Department of Justice for the paramilitary activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; \$38.5 billion to the Department of the Treasury for the Military Retirement Fund; \$7.6 billion for the military-related activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and well over \$200 billion in interest for past debt-financed defense outlays. This brings US spending for its military establishment during the current fiscal year (2008), conservatively calculated, to at least \$1.1 trillion.

Military Keynesianism

Such expenditures are not only morally obscene, they are fiscally unsustainable. Many neo-conservatives and poorly informed patriotic Americans believe that, even though our defense budget is huge, we can afford it because we are the richest country on Earth.

Unfortunately, that statement is no longer true. The world's richest political entity, according to the Central Intelligence Agency's World Factbook, is the European Union. The EU's 2006 GDP (gross domestic product - all goods and services produced domestically) was estimated to be slightly larger than that of the US. However, China's 2006 GDP was only slightly smaller than that of the US, and Japan was the world's fourth-richest nation.

A more telling comparison that reveals just how much worse we're doing can be found among the "current accounts" of various nations. The current account measures the net trade surplus or deficit of a country plus cross-border payments of interest, royalties, dividends, capital gains, foreign aid, and other income.

For example, for Japan to manufacture anything, it must import all required raw materials. Even after this incredible expense is met, it still has an \$88 billion per year trade surplus with the United States and enjoys the world's second-highest current account balance. (China is number one.) The United States, by contrast, is number 163 - dead last on the list, worse than countries like Australia and the United Kingdom that also have large trade deficits. Its 2006 current account deficit was \$811.5 billion; second worst was Spain at \$106.4 billion. This is what is unsustainable.

It's not just that our tastes for foreign goods, including imported oil, vastly exceed our ability to pay for them. We are financing them through massive borrowing. On November 7, 2007, the US Treasury announced that the national debt had breached \$9 trillion for the first time ever. This was just five weeks after Congress raised the so-called debt ceiling to \$9.815 trillion. If you begin in 1789, at the moment the constitution became the supreme law of the land, the debt accumulated by the federal government did not top \$1 trillion until 1981. When Bush became president in January 2001, it stood at approximately \$5.7 trillion. Since then, it has increased by 45%. This huge debt can be largely explained by our defense expenditures in comparison with the rest of the world.

The world's top 10 military spenders and the approximate amounts each country currently budgets for its military establishment are:

1. United States (FY08 budget), \$623 billion
2. China (2004), \$65 billion
3. Russia, \$50 billion
4. France (2005), \$45 billion
5. Japan (2007), \$41.75 billion
6. Germany (2003), \$35.1 billion
7. Italy (2003), \$28.2 billion
8. South Korea (2003), \$21.1 billion
9. India (2005 est.), \$19 billion
10. Saudi Arabia (2005 est.), \$18 billion

World total military expenditures (2004 est.), \$1,100 billion

World total (minus the United States), \$500 billion.

Our excessive military expenditures did not occur over just a few short years or simply because of the Bush administration's policies. They have been going on for a very long time in accordance with a superficially plausible ideology and have now become entrenched in our democratic political system where they are starting to wreak havoc. This ideology I call "military Keynesianism" - the determination to maintain a permanent war economy and to treat military output as an ordinary economic product, even though it makes no contribution to either production or consumption.

This ideology goes back to the first years of the Cold War. During the late 1940s, the US was haunted by economic anxieties. The Great Depression of the 1930s had been overcome only by the war production boom of World War II. With peace and demobilization, there was a pervasive fear that the Depression would return.

During 1949, alarmed by the Soviet Union's detonation of an atomic bomb, the looming communist victory in the Chinese civil war, a domestic recession, and the lowering of the Iron Curtain around the USSR's European satellites, the US sought to draft basic strategy for the emerging Cold War. The result was the militaristic National Security Council Report 68 (NSC-68) drafted under the supervision of Paul Nitze, then head of the Policy Planning Staff in the State Department. Dated April 14, 1950, and signed by president Harry S Truman on September 30, 1950, it laid out the basic public economic policies that the United States pursues to the present day.

In its conclusions, NSC-68 asserted: "One of the most significant lessons of our World War II experience was that the American economy, when it operates at a level approaching full efficiency, can provide enormous resources for purposes other than civilian consumption while simultaneously providing a high standard of living."

With this understanding, American strategists began to build up a massive munitions industry, both to counter the military might of the Soviet Union (which they consistently overstated) and also to maintain full employment as well as ward off a possible return of the Depression. The result was that, under Pentagon leadership, entire new industries were created to manufacture large aircraft, nuclear-powered submarines, nuclear warheads, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and surveillance and communications satellites. This led to what president Dwight D Eisenhower warned against in his farewell address of February 6, 1961: "The conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience." That is, the military-industrial complex.

By 1990, the value of the weapons, equipment, and factories devoted to the Department of Defense was 83% of the value of all plants and equipment in American manufacturing. From 1947 to 1990, the combined US military budgets

amounted to \$8.7 trillion. Even though the Soviet Union no longer exists, US reliance on military Keynesianism has, if anything, ratcheted up, thanks to the massive vested interests that have become entrenched around the military establishment. Over time, a commitment to both guns and butter has proven an unstable configuration. Military industries crowd out the civilian economy and lead to severe economic weaknesses. Devotion to military Keynesianism is, in fact, a form of slow economic suicide.

On May 1, 2007, the Center for Economic and Policy Research of Washington, DC, released a study prepared by the global forecasting company Global Insight on the long-term economic impact of increased military spending. Guided by economist Dean Baker, this research showed that, after an initial demand stimulus, by about the sixth year the effect of increased military spending turns negative. Needless to say, the US economy has had to cope with growing defense spending for more than 60 years. He found that, after 10 years of higher defense spending, there would be 464,000 fewer jobs than in a baseline scenario that involved lower defense spending.

Baker concluded:

It is often believed that wars and military spending increases are good for the economy. In fact, most economic models show that military spending diverts resources from productive uses, such as consumption and investment, and ultimately slows economic growth and reduces employment.

These are only some of the many deleterious effects of military Keynesianism.

Hollowing out the American economy

It was believed that the US could afford both a massive military establishment and a high standard of living, and that it needed both to maintain full employment. But it did not work out that way. By the 1960s, it was becoming apparent that turning over the nation's largest manufacturing enterprises to the Department of Defense and producing goods without any investment or consumption value was starting to crowd out civilian economic activities.

Historian Thomas E Woods Jr observes that, during the 1950s and 1960s, between one-third and two-thirds of all American research talent was siphoned off into the military sector. It is, of course, impossible to know what innovations never appeared as a result of this diversion of resources and brainpower into the service of the military, but it was during the 1960s that we first began to notice Japan was outpacing us in the design and quality of a range of consumer goods, including household electronics and automobiles.

Nuclear weapons furnish a striking illustration of these anomalies. Between the 1940s and 1996, the United States spent at least \$5.8 trillion on the development, testing and construction of nuclear bombs. By 1967, the peak year of its nuclear

stockpile, the US possessed some 32,500 deliverable atomic and hydrogen bombs, none of which, thankfully, was ever used.

They perfectly illustrate the Keynesian principle that the government can provide make-work jobs to keep people employed. Nuclear weapons were not just America's secret weapon, but also its secret economic weapon. As of 2006, we still had 9,960 of them. There is today no sane use for them, while the trillions spent on them could have been used to solve the problems of social security and health care, quality education and access to higher education for all, not to speak of the retention of highly skilled jobs within the American economy.

The pioneer in analyzing what has been lost as a result of military Keynesianism was the late Seymour Melman (1917-2004), a professor of industrial engineering and operations research at Columbia University. His 1970 book, *Pentagon Capitalism: The Political Economy of War*, was a prescient analysis of the unintended consequences of the American preoccupation with its armed forces and their weaponry since the onset of the Cold War. Melman wrote (pages. 2-3):

From 1946 to 1969, the United States government spent over \$1,000 billion on the military, more than half of this under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations - the period during which the [Pentagon-dominated] state management was established as a formal institution. This sum of staggering size (try to visualize a billion of something) does not express the cost of the military establishment to the nation as a whole. The true cost is measured by what has been foregone, by the accumulated deterioration in many facets of life by the inability to alleviate human wretchedness of long duration.

In an important exegesis on Melman's relevance to the current American economic situation, Thomas Woods writes:

According to the US Department of Defense, during the four decades from 1947 through 1987 it used (in 1982 dollars) \$7.62 trillion in capital resources. In 1985, the Department of Commerce estimated the value of the nation's plant and equipment, and infrastructure, at just over \$7.29 trillion. In other words, the amount spent over that period could have doubled the American capital stock or modernized and replaced its existing stock.

The fact that we did not modernize or replace our capital assets is one of the main reasons why, by the turn of the 21st century, our manufacturing base had all but evaporated. Machine tools - an industry on which Melman was an authority - are a particularly important symptom.

In November 1968, a five-year inventory disclosed (page 186) "that 64% of the metalworking machine tools used in US industry were 10 years old or older. The age of this industrial equipment (drills, lathes, etc.) marks the United States' machine tool stock as the oldest among all major industrial nations, and it marks the continuation of a deterioration process that began with the end of World War II. This deteriora-

tion at the base of the industrial system certifies to the continuous debilitating and depleting effect that the military use of capital and research and development talent has had on American industry.

Nothing has been done in the period since 1968 to reverse these trends and it shows today in our massive imports of equipment - from medical machines like proton accelerators for radiological therapy (made primarily in Belgium, Germany and Japan) to cars and trucks.

Our short tenure as the world's "lone superpower" has come to an end. As Harvard economics professor Benjamin Friedman has written:

Again and again it has always been the world's leading lending country that has been the premier country in terms of political influence, diplomatic influence, and cultural influence. It's no accident that we took over the role from the British at the same time that we took over ... the job of being the world's leading lending country. Today we are no longer the world's leading lending country. In fact we are now the world's biggest debtor country, and we are continuing to wield influence on the basis of military prowess alone.

Some of the damage done can never be rectified. There are, however, some steps that this country urgently needs to take. These include reversing Bush's 2001 and 2003 tax cuts for the wealthy, beginning to liquidate our global empire of over 800 military bases, cutting from the defense budget all projects that bear no relationship to the national security of the United States, and ceasing to use the defense budget as a Keynesian jobs program. If we do these things we have a chance of squeaking by. If we don't, we face probable national insolvency and a long depression.

Chalmers Johnson is the author of *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic*, just published in paperback. It is the final volume of his *Blowback Trilogy*, which also includes *Blowback* (2000) and *The Sorrows of Empire* (2004).

(For those interested, click [here](#) to view a clip from a new film, Chalmers Johnson on American Hegemony, in Cinema Libre Studios' *Speaking Freely* series in which he discusses "military Keynesianism" and imperial bankruptcy.)

Source: http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/JA24Ak04.html

NeoCon vs. NeoComm

In the first article here, Pat Buchanan compares the Neocon's to early communists and outlines how they came to power and how they are financed. NeoCon, or as we see it, should be called NeoComm in honor of their communist dogma; it's one in the same. The second article in this chapter is by Tom Piatak, who explains what makes a Neocon tick.

by Patrick J. Buchanan

The Comintern, or Communist International, also known as the Third International, was the 1919 creation of Vladimir Lenin.

Its declared purpose: Fight "by all available means, including armed force, for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie and for the creation of an international Soviet republic."

Fomenting the communist revolution worldwide was, in brief, the Comintern's mission. ..

For this act of heresy, Trotsky, the champion of permanent revolution, excommunicated Stalin as a "reformist" - and was himself rewarded in 1940 with an ice ax in the head, courtesy of Stalinist assassin Ramon Mercader.

But Trotskyism did not die with Leon Trotsky. It mutated and is today the taproot of that Neoconservatism that calls for permanent revolution to advance not global communism, but global democracy. Today, this ideology is embedded in the Party of Reagan and the Bush administration, and neoconservatives are using tax dollars to create and operate their own Neo-Comintern.

The National Endowment for Democracy (NED), which pumps out tens of millions of dollars to "promote democracy" abroad, is its pivotal agency. For 20 years, it has been headed by Carl Gershman, who broke from the Socialist Party to organize Social Democrats USA, which rallied to the candidacy of liberal Democratic Sen. Henry "Scoop" Jackson, whose staff was a nesting ground of neocons from Richard Perle to Frank Gaffney to Elliott Abrams.

One organization captured by the Neo-Comintern is Freedom House. Founded by Eleanor Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie in 1941 as a voice for global democracy and human rights, Freedom House, on the eve of the Iraq war, chose as its new chairman ex-CIA Director James Woolsey. By his first anniversary in office, Woolsey had declared Vladimir Putin's Russia "un-free" and was beating the drums for "World War IV" against "Islamofascism."

Flush with tax dollars and tax-deductible contributions, NED, Freedom House, and their collaborator foundations and think tanks now routinely interfere in the internal affairs of foreign nations. Under the rubric of promoting democracy, creating free markets, etc., they seek to dethrone recalcitrant rulers and advance to power those who share their ideology and will advance their interests and agenda.

Democracy is our goal, the neocons claim. But viewing their target lists in the Middle East, Near East, Central Asia, and Latin America, it is perhaps more exact to say the Neo-Comintern seeks destabilization of any and all regimes that fail to meet its criteria for membership in their world democratic revolution.

Though a radical leftist populist, Venezuela's Hugo Chavez was democratically elected. He charges that NED had a hand in the 2002 coup that briefly overthrew his government and in the recall election forced upon him in 2004. Foreign journalists contend that the color-coded popular "revolutions" that ousted Milosevic in Serbia, Shevardnadze in Georgia, and the Kuchma crowd in Ukraine were also made in the USA and hand-tooled at Langley.

Observing Kiev's "orange revolution" unfold, the Guardian's Ian Traynor called it "an American creation, a sophisticated and brilliantly conceived exercise in Western branding and mass marketing that, in four countries in four years, has been used to try to salvage rigged elections and topple unsavory regimes."

Russian President Putin, however, is a former KGB colonel who knows a little about subversion and wants to guarantee that what happened to his friends in Belgrade and Kiev does not happen to him or his chosen successor when he transfers power in 2008. And he is moving to restrict, and perhaps expedite the expulsion of, all

American and Western meddlers in Russian politics.

"Organizations functioning in our country and involved in political activity are basically being used as instruments of foreign policy of other states," says Putin. And the man has a point.

Which raises questions for our own government. By what right does the United States, through tax-funded and tax-exempt organizations, interfere in the politics of nations that have not attacked or threatened us? Were the Chinese to intrude in the politics of Mexico and Central America as we have in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, would we not be enraged? Would we not react?

Given that resentment of the United States is pandemic in Latin America, the Middle East, and Europe, what benefits do we derive from incessantly intruding in the internal affairs of these nations to justify the rising cost in elite and popular ill will? Did we defeat the world communist revolution only to launch our own world democratic revolution? Did we bury the Comintern of Stalin only to create our own? What happened to the America that minded her own business? Why is Bush outsourcing foreign policy to neocons who are the source of most of his headaches today?

In their view, invasion of Iraq was not merely, or even primarily, about getting rid of Saddam Hussein. Nor was it really about weapons of mass destruction, though their elimination was an important benefit. Rather, the administration sees the invasion as only the first move in a wider effort to reorder the power structure of the entire Middle East.

Source:

November 30, 2005
Putin vs. the Neo-Comintern
by Patrick J. Buchanan

The Purest Neocon

By Tom Piatak

There is no denying Christopher Hitchens's skill as a public figure: he is seldom at a loss for words, sometimes entertaining, and occasionally even right. But he keeps getting important things wrong because, throughout his political wanderings, there persists a strange loyalty to an obscure bloodthirsty revolutionary and to the ideals of the Bolshevik Revolution. For Hitchens-now honored throughout the neoconservative Right-remains what he has been throughout his public life, a disciple of Leon Trotsky and a talented writer and polemicist-perhaps the most talented polemicist the Bolshevik tradition has produced in the West.

Given Hitchens's current role as a neocon fellow traveler, it is instructive (not to mention fun) to recall with whom he used to travel. When the United States was locked in a mortal struggle with Soviet Communism, Hitchens was at best AWOL, at worst pulling for the other team. From his safe post at *The New Statesman* and later *The Nation*, Hitchens opposed every effort to defeat Communism-including the defense of South Vietnam, the deployment of cruise missiles and Pershing missiles in Europe, the invasion of Grenada, American support for the Contras, and Reagan's military buildup. Hitchens can be sensitive about his past-he is quite angry with his brother Peter for letting us know that Christopher used to joke about not caring "if the Red Army waters its horses in Hendon"-but there can be no doubt where Hitchens stood during the Cold War. He was faithfully following Leon Trotsky, who wrote in 1939, "the defense of the USSR coincides for us with the preparation of world revolution."

Rather than worrying about Soviet Communism, Hitchens spent his *Nation* years fighting against what he called "a regime of crime and corruption in the White House. ... necessitated by a war on revolution overseas and on democracy at home." This description-typical of Hitchens's invective against Ronald Reagan-was contained in a fawning letter to "Comrade Ramirez," a functionary of the Sandinista dictatorship in Nicaragua. Hitchens unbosomed that, far from hoping for an American victory in the Cold War, he was hoping for a "socialist renewal in the Soviet Union." Hitchens also told his friend in Managua, "It is quite likely that historians will record this unhappy period not as an age of Reagan at all, but as a footnote to the age of Mikhail Gorbachev."

Elsewhere, Hitchens turned out lines worthy of Soviet Life, such as this observation from a pre-invasion visit to the budding Communist dictatorship in Grenada: "The general enthusiasm, the internationalism and the determination of the Grenadan people is an inspiring thing to witness."

Then there was the column Hitchens wrote in 1982, blasting anti-Communists for talking about "appeasement" and "Finlandization." In the midst of Hitchens's long-winded explanation of why these were "bogus ideological words" and their use was "an insult-and not only to Finland," comes a plangent reminder of the place Hitchens was happy to call home during the Cold War: an advertisement enticing readers to "spend Your Vacation with The Nation and Cruise Up the Volga." The CPUSA was not listed as a sponsor, but that would probably have been redundant for a trip also sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

More insight into Hitchens's long love affair with Bolshevism came with the publication in 2002 of his close friend Martin Amis's *Koba the Dread*, a masterful account of the mass murder with which the Bolsheviks busied themselves after seizing power in October 1917. Hitchens told Amis, "Lenin was ... a great man" and implored him not to "fall for moral equivalence." What Hitchens warned against was not viewing the West as equivalent to the USSR (a view generally attacked at *The Nation* only by those asserting straightforward Soviet superiority), but a belief that Soviet Communism could legitimately be compared to its (slightly less) murderous rival, Nazism.

It is true that, even as Trotsky had criticized Stalin, Hitchens felt free to criticize the USSR occasionally at *The Nation*-though generally without the venom reserved for the "Christian bigots" and "thwarted militarists" Hitchens saw in the "Reagan junta," the "fascists" allied with the United States against Communism, and such obvious evildoers as Mother Teresa. But Hitchens, still following Trotsky, generally coupled these criticisms with attacks on the West or on anti-Communists, as in a 1986 piece on Chernobyl, where he devoted almost all his space to describing "two cases of potential and actual nuclear irradiation that were visited on unsuspecting peoples by NATO governments." And after Solidarity had been outlawed and Lech Walesa imprisoned, Hitchens participated in a *Nation* forum on Communism and Poland in which-to his credit-he wrote that it was legitimate to defend the "Polish workers movement," but also fretted about "the Manichaeian anti-Communism of the bad old days," wished that Walesa had denounced Pinochet, and rebuked Susan Sontag for saying that Communism was akin to fascism and that the reliably anti-Communist *Readers' Digest* had done a better job of informing its readers of the realities of Communism than had *The Nation* or *The New Statesman*-coincidentally (or not) Hitchens's journalistic homes during the Cold War.

Hitchens also asserted that most of the Left did not have a problem with Poland, ignoring the fatuousness of the other contributors to the forum and his own magazine, which wanted to "transcend the hand-wringing platitudes of the Reagan Administration and to create some distance between radical Americans and the evident hypocrisy of 'Let Poland Be Poland.'" Hitchens, too, had distinct limits to his sympathy for the Poles: the next time Hitchens managed to write about Poland in *The Nation*, in January 1983, it was to mock the Poles, including John Paul II and Lech Walesa, for their religious beliefs. While the world watched the courage of Catholic Poland with admiration, Hitchens sneered. There is a reason streets in Poland are being named after Ronald Reagan and not writers for *The Nation*. Hitchens has never apologized for his Trotskyism. As he told British writer Johann Hari in October 2004, "I don't regret anything. ... [The socialist movement's] achievements were real, and I'm glad I was a part of it." And in the July/August 2004 issue of *The Atlantic*, Hitchens wrote a hagiographic essay about a figure whom he claimed "always was ... a prophetic moralist." Hitchens was not writing about Mother Teresa or John Paul II, but about Leon Trotsky—a man who was an active participant in and apologist for Lenin's Red Terror, the inventor of the "blocking units" that would gun down Russian troops foolish enough to defy the commissars by retreating, and the author of such witty aphorisms as "We must rid ourselves once and for all of the Quaker-Papist babble about the sanctity of human life."

Hitchens also took Amis to task for *Koba the Dread* in *The Atlantic*, criticizing him for suggesting the dreaded moral equivalence between the Nazis and the Communists and for wondering if the right side won the Russian Civil War. Hitchens's dogged determination to defend Lenin shows that he is, at heart, as intense a believer as any radical Islamist. After all, it was one thing to believe in 1917 that the Bolsheviks might be better than the Romanovs; it is quite another to believe that still today, tens of millions of corpses later.

Amis had also made the mistake, in a letter to Hitchens, of urging his friend to turn his back on Trotsky because Hitchens's "prophetic moralist" was really a "nun-killer." Amis should have realized that an appeal based on sympathy for nuns was hardly the way to his friend's heart, and Hitchens responded by mocking Amis for having a "special horror of Bolshevik anti-clericalism." What Amis has a "special horror of" is eloquently described in his book: a regime that killed 2,691 priests, 1,962 monks, and 3,447 nuns of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1922 alone. None of this bloodshed bothers Hitchens, who has recently written that "Secularism ... only became thinkable after several wars and revolutions had ruthlessly smashed the hold of the clergy on the state." Since the American Revolution did not produce a single executed clergyman, Hitchens is here singing the praises of the Jacobins and the Bolsheviks.

Indeed, nothing shows Hitchens's continuing fidelity to the Bolshevik ideal more than his hatred for religion. He told the *Guardian* on May 31, 2005, "I can't stand anyone who believes in God, who invokes the divinity ... I mean, that to me is a horrible, repulsive thing." But Hitchens is by no means equal in his contempt for religions. He has written favorably of Judaism and described Islam as having been a "civilizing and creative force in many societies." Hitchens has no such kind words for Christianity, especially as manifested in the Roman Catholic Church. This is hardly surprising: the Roman Catholic Church was Bolshevism's most consistent and successful adversary, beginning with the 1920 defense of Warsaw from Trotsky's Red Army, when the future Pius XI, in Norman Davies's words, "stood on the ramparts of Radzymin and cursed the advancing hordes of Antichrist in person" and the Polish Army-dismissed by Trotsky as being "steeped in priests' lies"-prevented the Red Army from watering its horses anywhere near Hendon.

A straightforward description of all Hitchens's anti-Catholic outbursts would fill every page in this magazine-he recently argued, in essence, that Judge Roberts should not be confirmed to the Supreme Court because he is Catholic-but his most disgusting, and revealing, anti-Catholic spasm was his reaction to the death of John Paul II, a man he dismissed as "an elderly and querulous celibate, who came too late and who stayed too long."

Speaking ill of the dead is a Hitchens trademark, with Mother Teresa, Bob Hope, and Ronald Reagan-whom Hitchens described as "dumb as a stump" and a "cruel and stupid lizard"-each rating a bilious sendoff. But John Paul II rated two. Hitchens blamed the pope for such wide-ranging evils as the "enslavement of the Middle East" and "the millions who will die needlessly from AIDS," a disease whose sexual transmission would cease if Catholic teaching were followed. Hitchens also blasted John Paul for harboring Cardinal Law from justice, ignoring the fact that Cardinal Law was never convicted of any crime or even indicted because, as the prosecutor told the *Boston Globe*, "there was no intent that we have found to assist in any way in criminal acts."

Hitchens also criticized the pope for opposing the First Gulf War, writing, "I have never read any deployment of Augustinian argument ... that would not qualify it as a just war." Yet at the time, Hitchens denounced the First Gulf War as a "contrived war" of "discreditable origins," blamed the United States for "the infliction of a Dresden on the Iraqi people," and looked forward to "fresh Augustinian tautologies from our churchmen about proportionality in a just war."

But the most repellent aspect of Hitchens's diatribes was the sly way he sought to minimize John Paul's role in the transformation of Eastern Europe, implying that the credit belonged to "the Polish workers" and "Warsaw's dissident intellectuals ... who

thought of Cardinal Glemp ... as one of their main enemies." The reality of Poland is deeply embarrassing to someone who views the world as Hitchens does, which is why he indulges in fantasies about nameless "workers" and secular intellectuals battling evil Catholics.

The bare facts are these: the institution in Poland that gave dissidents, even secular intellectuals, the civic space to operate during the years of Soviet rule was the Catholic Church. The "Polish workers" who began the revolt that ended up toppling the Soviet Union were the workers at the Lenin shipyard in Gdansk, who during their historic strike decorated the main gate of the shipyard with precisely two pictures—one of John Paul II, one of Our Lady of Czestochowa. (Leon Trotsky was nowhere in sight.) The leader of those workers was Lech Walesa, who posed in his first photograph after the strike under a crucifix, who afterwards customarily wore an icon of Our Lady of Czestochowa on his lapel, who signed the Gdansk agreement ending the strike with a souvenir pen bearing the likeness of John Paul II, and who left his Nobel Peace Prize as a votive offering at the Jasna Gora monastery where the famous icon of Our Lady is found. All of these symbolic gestures were carefully considered and show the profoundly Catholic nature of the peaceful Polish revolt that ended up discrediting Bolshevism in both its Stalinist and Trotskyist variants. Regardless of their views on other issues, Poles credit John Paul's epochal 1979 visit with inspiring all that followed. Indeed, the dissident publication

Robotnik-- associated with the sort of intellectuals Hitchens wants to credit instead of the pope--wrote the epitaph for Soviet Communism just 10 days after John Paul's triumphant Mass in Krakow before the largest gathering in Polish history, in words that Hitchens would never write, or even acknowledge having been written: "Pathetically silent was the ideology created without God and against God."

So where does this lover of Trotsky and hater of God, this despiser of religion and tradition and devotee of "permanent revolution," this anti-Catholic bigot and reviler of Reagan and John Paul, now find an ideological home? Among the neoconservatives, naturally. As Hitchens told Johann Hari in the same interview where he said "I don't regret anything," he admires Paul Wolfowitz, whom he described as a "real bleeding heart." According to Hari, Hitchens sees neoconservatism as a "distinctively new strain of thought, preached by ex-leftists, who believed in using US power to spread democracy." Hari also wrote that Hitchens believes that if neoconservatism "can become dominant within the Republican Party, it can turn US power into a revolutionary force." Barry Didcock came to a similar conclusion in the June 5, 2005 Sunday Herald after interviewing Hitchens: "The way Hitchens tells it, he began to realize, as the 1990s wore on, that US force could and should be used to fight what he saw as the forces of fascism." Hitchens still wants world revolution; the only difference is that now he sees us Americans as perfectly placed to do the fighting and the dying needed to achieve his Trotskyist dream.

As both the Hari and Didcock interviews make clear, Hitchens was able to overcome his past squeamishness about American military force not because America is threatened, but because the threat now comes from men who believe in Allah rather than Marx. Didcock notes, "the origins of [Hitchens's] position lie in his long-held distaste for religion," and Hitchens told Hari, "The United States was attacked by theocratic fascists who represent all the most reactionary elements on earth. ... However bad the American Empire has been, it is not as bad as this." Hitchens also wrote-in the same column in which he extolled the priest-killing potency of the French and Russian Revolutions-that "George Bush may subjectively be a Christian, but he-and the US armed forces-have objectively done more for secularism than the whole of the American agnostic community combined and doubled." Hitchens's entire politics is motivated by his hatred of religion and tradition; he'd be just as happy bombing St. Peter's as the Taliban.

Needless to say, Hitchens's views have nothing to do with American conservatism or even American patriotism, which sees America as a real country and a real place, not as a template onto which foreigners project their ideological fantasies. None of the Founders wanted to use American power to bring about world revolution, nor did they believe in wasting American blood and treasure in grandiose ideological crusades. Neither did Ronald Reagan. While effusive in his praise for the neocons, Hitchens told Hari that he would never join "the Buchanan-Reagan right." For their part, the neocons have warmly embraced Hitchens. His writing is welcomed at *The Weekly Standard*, which also gave a glowing review to his latest book, and at *FrontPageMag.com*, which has given him three sycophantic interviews and describes him as "one of the most prominent political and cultural essayists of our time." Regulars at *National Review Online* praise and link to Hitchens's work, and David Frum has boasted there of his friendship with Hitchens. Recently, Hitchens was even allowed to post in NRO's Corner to respond to Ramesh Ponnuru's flaccid criticism of his Catholic-bashing piece on Judge Roberts. (Ponnuru agreed that he found Hitchens's outbursts on the pope "bracing," but he drew the line when Hitchens used his anti-Catholicism against the Bush administration.) NRO has hardly been as accommodating to any of the traditional conservatives its writers have smeared.

The irony, of course, is that Hitchens has hardly cast his lot with the "Let A Hundred Flowers Bloom" school of conservatism. The neocons prattle on endlessly about "moral clarity" and display a fondness for ideological purges but have never been anything but indulgent toward Hitchens. They have not criticized his Bolshevism or his hatred of religion. In fact, one of the Hitchens columns Frum praised at NRO described the Catholic Church as "foolish" and Opus Dei as a "sinister cult organization." Let us not even pause to consider what Frum would have done if some paleo-

conservative had written a glowing essay describing Rudolf Hess as a "prophetic moralist": whole forests would need to be felled to print his denunciations of the miscreant.

What the mutual embrace of Hitchens and the neocons tells us is that Hitchens's assessment of neoconservatism is essentially correct: the regnant force in American conservatism today is warmed-over Trotskyism, which views America merely as the embodiment of the ideology of global revolution. This is, admittedly, a depressing conclusion. But there is hope. Hitchens spent the first half of his ideological career riding a dying horse. He may have just started riding another one.

Tom Piatak writes from Cleveland, Ohio.

Source: http://www.amconmag.com/2005/2005_10_10/article3.html

NeoComms in Office

Is Hillary Clinton a Neocon?

by Edward H. Crane

"You know, when I ask people, 'What do you think the goals of America are today?' people don't have any idea. We don't know what we're trying to achieve. And I think that in a life or in a country you've got to have some goals." Senator Hillary Clinton, MSNBC, May 11, 2007

Senator Hillary Clinton's worldview, as formulated above, is starkly at odds with that of America's founders. The idea that the American nation had "goals", just as individuals do, would have been wholly alien to them. For them the whole undertaking of government was to protect our "self-evident" rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This emphasis on the primacy of the individual is the essence of true American exceptionalism.

National goals are a euphemism for concentrated national political power. The "Old World" was full of nations with goals, almost all pernicious. The concept of national goals is not so much un-American as it is non-American. But Mrs. Clinton persists in promoting the concept, saying at a recent campaign speech in New Hampshire that rather than an "ownership society" she would "prefer a 'we're all in it together' society". She frequently invokes the notion that Americans want "to be part of something bigger than themselves".

She has an unusual ally in this. The one other powerful political force in the US today that shares her frustration over the lack of national goals is neoconservatism. Neocons call it "national greatness". Their theorists Bill

Kristol and Robert Kagan called President George W. Bush's willingness to "engage wherever necessary around the world" a recognition of "an essential part of national greatness".

Perhaps its most articulate proponent, however, is David Brooks, the New York Times columnist. Mr. Brooks wrings his hands in a Weekly Standard article that "Americans have discarded their pursuit of national greatness in just about every particular". And how would he describe that goal? "Individual ambition and willpower are channelled into the cause of national greatness. And by making the nation great, individuals are able to join their narrow concerns to a larger national project." "Ultimately," he continues, "American purpose can find its voice only in Washington."

Mrs. Clinton would appear to have found a soulmate in Mr. Brooks, if not a future running mate.

Yet there is more to Mrs. Clinton's neocon connections. Another characteristic she shares is the promiscuity with which both camps would use the federal government - as if there simply were no constitutional limits on federal power. Given the neocons' high profile in pushing us into the Iraq war, it is often overlooked how far their domestic policies unfailingly call for vigorous federal initiatives.

The federal takeover of education, dubbed "No Child Left Behind", is a neocon project. So, too, was the Faith-based Initiative that funded local religious organisations. Mr. Brooks recently called for presidential candidates to "create a flourishing families committee. Get economists, religious activists, and psychologists in one room to figure out how government can reduce stress on struggling families". This would be the same government that took three days to discover that Hurricane Katrina had created a bit of a problem in New Orleans.

Not to be outdone, in *It Takes a Village* (the "village" being the federal government), Mrs. Clinton suggests the government should fund videos on baby care that "could be running continuously in doctors' offices, clinics, hospitals, motor vehicle offices, or any other place where people gather and have to wait". Shades of 1984.

Expansive government is always going to be a project of those who would subject individuals to collective, national goals. The founders were well aware of this danger, which is why they gave us a constitution of enumerated - and therefore limited - powers. As Thomas Jefferson put it: "I consider the foundations of the constitution as laid on this ground that 'all powers not delegated to the US, by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states or to the people'. To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power no longer susceptible of

any definitions." Mrs. Clinton looks in danger of following the fateful path of the neocons, with her aim to take possession of that boundless field.

Source

Cato Institute: July 12, 2007

http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8495

This article appeared in the Financial Times on July 11, 2007.

John McCain and the Neocon Resurgence

Philip Giraldi

The neoconservatives, who have never been right about anything, have lately suffered more knockdowns than "The Bull of the Pampas," Luis Firpo, did in his first round with Jack Dempsey in 1923, but hopes for their demise as a political force have unfortunately proven to be premature. Part of the problem is that the blog and counterculture world where the neocons have been eviscerated is not the world of the New York Times, the Washington Post, Fox News, or the Wall Street Journal, where they continue to set the pace on the editorial and opinion pages. The presence of two neoconservatives, William Kristol and David Brooks, at the ostensibly liberal New York Times is a testimony to their resiliency, as is the Times' endorsement of John McCain as the Republican presidential nominee. Beyond the media, the neocons have deeply embedded themselves in the political system and continue to play a major role in the campaigns of the various presidential candidates of both parties, frequently as foreign policy advisers.

With the withdrawal of Romney, Washington pundits unanimously agree that John McCain will defeat Huckabee to become the Republican nominee. McCain is the neocons' anointed choice for president of the United States, and has been so for many years. He was their candidate when he ran against George Bush in the primaries in 2000 and again when he announced his candidacy for 2008. When McCain's campaign underachieved last summer and it appeared that Rudy Giuliani would be the Republican candidate, many leading neocons, including Norman Podhoretz and Daniel Pipes, joined the New Yorker's campaign. Now that Giuliani has withdrawn, they will presumably return home again, rejoining Robert Kagan and James Woolsey, both of whom have been with McCain since early 2007. That McCain is no traditional conservative if measured by his views on cultural and fiscal issues matters not at all, because the Israel-and-empire-fixated neocons consider such issues unimportant. Nor is there any concern for McCain's hypocrisy on other issues, such as torture, where he publicly opposed the administration before agreeing to a White House-supported bill that permitted waterboarding and other practices.

With McCain as their nominee, the Republicans will be running on a "fear" platform, emphasizing the threat posed by terrorism. Mitt Romney withdrew citing the necessity of winning in Iraq and not surrendering to the terrorists, implying that such pusillanimity is precisely what one might expect from the Democrats if the Republicans do not present a united front. McCain's subsequent speech at the American Conservative Union (ACU) convention provided more of the same, calling for action against Iran and victory over Islamic extremists. On the following day, President Bush called for Republican unity and made essentially the same points about terrorists. It is clear that the Republicans will be the party of war and that they will emphasize their ability to deal with international threats better than the Democrats.

The neocons and McCain do not disguise their belief that Iran must be dealt with by military means because diplomacy has failed. Indeed, one might well regard defanging Iran as their principal foreign policy objective, one that they share with the White House and the Israeli government. John McCain's sentiment toward Iran is unrelentingly belligerent. One only has to recall his rendition of the Beach Boys' song "Barbara Ann" substituting the words "Bomb, bomb, bomb, bomb, bomb Iran" to realize that the ideologically driven Arizona Republican is not interested in talk if cruise missiles are available. McCain's version of "straight talk" on Iran suggests that he lacks the basic good judgment the American public would presumably like to see in a president.

McCain's speech before the ACU revealed that he supports the U.S. presence in Iraq until there is a "victory," that he will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon, and that he is committed to fighting against "Islamic extremists" for as long as it takes to defeat them. In an earlier speech in New Hampshire he stated that it would be fine with him if the U.S. were to remain in Iraq for one hundred years. In Florida, shortly before that state's primary, McCain declared that there would be "other wars" in America's future, but that "we will never surrender." There should be no confusion about McCain's intentions, which are basically all war all the time. He has also declared that the United States has a right to deal with "rogue states" as it sees fit, and he has thrown down a challenge to Russia, insisting that Moscow should be expelled from the G-8 group of industrialized nations and that NATO should be expanded to include the Ukraine and Georgia, which the Kremlin would see as a direct threat. Ronald Reagan, who won the first Cold War, would undoubtedly be horrified by McCain's intention to start a second one.

Many observers in Washington believe that McCain intends to pull a shrewd maneuver to enhance his electability by packaging himself as someone who can end the partisan divide in Congress. McCain knows that the Republican Party's conservative base, which mistrusts him, has nowhere else to go in national elections. Able to take them for granted, he is already speaking of reaching out to moderates, liberals, and

traditional Democrats. He has worked closely with the Democrats on many occasions, and his voting record on many issues is decidedly non-Republican. He co-sponsored the McCain-Feingold legislation on political contributions and collaborated on the stillborn McCain-Kennedy amnesty plan for illegal immigrants, both of which were opposed by the Republican Party's conservative base.

To turn himself into a one-man bridge over troubled political waters, McCain will reportedly insist that his vice president be Sen. Joseph Lieberman, a lifelong Democrat who currently calls himself an independent. Lieberman endorsed McCain at the end of December and campaigned actively on his behalf in New Hampshire, Michigan, South Carolina, and Florida. In Florida he spoke to numerous Jewish groups around Miami, emphasizing McCain's support for Israel. Photos of McCain campaigning frequently feature Lieberman standing in the background. Joe Lieberman is also no social conservative, so he and McCain should get along just fine on most issues. Sources in Washington believe that Lieberman will conveniently become a Republican to gain the GOP's acceptance.

Joe Lieberman denies that he would even consider the position of vice president with his friend McCain, but one should note that an initial denial of one's true intentions has become routine in American politics. As the self-described "conscience of the Senate," Lieberman has voted a straight Democratic Party line on most issues, though he is most definitely a hard-liner when it comes to Israel and the Middle East. When he ran against Ned Lamont for the Senate in Connecticut in 2006 he denounced the latter as weak on Israeli security, saying that Lamont had surrounded himself with "people who were ... explicitly against Israel." Lieberman, like McCain, would like to attack Iran. He was the co-sponsor of the Kyl-Lieberman amendment that passed Congress in September 2007. Kyl-Lieberman declared that Iran is killing American soldiers and led to the naming of part of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard as a terrorist group, which would permit military action against it without any deliberation by Congress. Lieberman is opposed to negotiating with the Iranians, claiming that it is akin to a firefighter negotiating with an arsonist. He favors military action to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapons program and asserts that Iran is already at war with the U.S.

Americans who have opposed the Iraq war and who are against another war with Iran should begin to worry, because a McCain-Lieberman ticket would be very electable. It would be promoted as a demonstration that bipartisanship can work in Washington, and it would draw support from many independents and from a Democratic base that would welcome its relatively moderate positions on social issues and immigration. Many would be attracted by its lack of close ties to the religious Right.

McCain-Lieberman would also play the fear card extremely well, rallying both the Republican base, which is largely willing to ignore social issues when it comes to national security, and conservative Democrats. This would likely complete America's transition to a militarized state and would empower terrorists everywhere, resulting in constant warfare and bankrupting the United States in fairly short order. Such is the price of the neocon new world order.

